

**REMARKS**

Entry of the foregoing and reconsideration of the subject application are respectfully requested in light of the amendments above and the comments which follow.

Claims 1-26 were pending in this application. In this response, claims 1-26 are amended, claims 27-38 are added and no claims are canceled. Thus, claims 1-38 are pending.

Support for the foregoing amendments can be found, for example, in at least the following locations in the original disclosure: the original claims and the specification, page 3, lines 8-28, page 5, lines 7-15, page 6, lines 3-13 and 26-34.

**Objections to the Specification**

The Examiner objected to the abstract, title and lack of headings in the Specification.

The abstract has been amended to conform with U.S. standard, and thus the objection should be withdrawn. The title has been amended to be clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed, and thus the objection should be withdrawn.

Applicants thank the Examiner for providing the suggested guidelines for arranging the Specification. Although, the suggested headings are not required, especially for national stage entries of international applications filed under 35 U.S.C. § 371, Applicants have chosen to amend the specification with some headings for clarity.

### **Claim Objections**

Claims 1, 8, 10, and 26 are objected to for minor informalities. The claims have been amended as suggested by the Examiner, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections.

### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. The claims have been amended to address the rejections, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections.

### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,515,586 to Wymore (hereafter "Wymore").

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. To establish a *prima facie* case of anticipation, a single prior art reference must teach each and every element of the claimed invention, either explicitly or inherently. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. Cal.*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Wymore merely discloses a general description of a tactile sensory system to track the location of a person or object. The claimed invention is a method and arrangement for monitoring one or several objects with specific method steps and/or means that are not disclosed in Wymore.

Specifically, *Wymore* at least fails to disclose the following features of claim 1:

- 1) selecting conductors of first and second divisions of conductors;
- 2) connecting an excitation signal to the selected first division of conductors and performing a scanning cycle;
- 3) deriving a first signal from a coupling of the excitation signal between first and second selected divisions; and
- 4) processing the first signal to obtain information about impedance of the object.

Similarly, *Wymore* at least fails to disclose the following features of claim 10:

- 1) a distribution of conductors galvanically isolated from the object;
- 2) first and second divisions of selectable conductors;
- 3) means to perform a scanning cycle;
- 4) means to generate an excitation signal;
- 5) means to selectively connect said excitation signal to the first division of selectable conductors;
- 6) means to derive a first signal related to a coupling through impedance of the object; and
- 7) means for detecting changes of the impedance of the object to be monitored.

In particular, *Wymore* fails to disclose or suggest obtaining information about the impedance of the object to be monitored as claimed. Dependent claims 2-9 and 11-38, which depend from claims 1 and 10, respectively, are also not anticipated for at least

the same reasons as for claims 1 and 10. For at least these reasons, no *prima facie* case of anticipation has been established, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

**CONCLUSION**

From the foregoing, further and favorable action in the form of a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner feel that any issues remain, it is requested that the undersigned be contacted so that any such issues may be adequately addressed and prosecution of the instant application expedited.

Respectfully submitted,

DRINKER, BIDDLE & REATH LLP

Date: May 13, 2009

By: Christopher P. Bruenjes  
Christopher P. Bruenjes  
Reg. No. 62,941

**CUSTOMER NO. 055694**  
**DRINKER, BIDDLE & REATH LLP**  
1500 K Street, N.W., Suite 1100  
Washington, D.C. 20005-1209  
Tel: (202) 842-8800  
F: (202) 842-8465